

Marine Reserves Working Group  
Draft Meeting Summary  
Wednesday, October 18, 2000  
**Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary**  
**Marine Reserves Working Group Meeting**

Wednesday, October 18, 2000  
8:30 A.M. – 5:00 P.M.  
Veterans Memorial Building  
122 West Cabrillo Boulevard  
Santa Barbara, California

**Draft Meeting Summary**

---

In Attendance:

Patricia Wolf, Chair	Steve Roberson
Sean Hastings, for Matt Picket, Co-Chair	Alicia Stratton
Locky Brown	
Marla Daily	Bruce Steele (SAC)
Gary Davis	Satie Airame (Science Panel Post Doc)
Robert Fletcher	Ben Waltenberger (CINMS)
Craig Fusaro	
Dale Glantz	Michael Eng, Facilitator
Neil Guglielmo	John Jostes, Facilitator
Greg Helms	
Mark Helvey	CINMS staff - Mike Murray, Sarah
Deborah McArdle	Fangman, Shauna Bingham, Julie
Michael McGinnes	Goodson, Laura Francis; DFG Staff -
Chris Miller	Dave Parker, Paul Reilly, John Ugoretz
Tom Raftican	

---

**Welcome and Introductions:** Co-Chair Patty Wolf welcomed the MRWG and audience. Patty mentioned her recent promotion to Regional Manager of the Marine Region. Though she will have more responsibilities, she is fully committed to sticking with the MRWG process. Sean Hastings was sitting in for Sanctuary Manager; Matt Picket, who is receiving the NOAA Bronze medal for his work during the Alaska Airlines accident. Sean conveyed that Matt was impressed with the MRWG's progress to date and pleased and overwhelmed by the large turnout at the public forum.

**Overview of Meeting Agenda:** John Jostes updated the group on his participation in a panel discussion at a Calif. State Bar Association meeting where he presented the MRWG process, highlighting the group's leadership and the courage of participants in working together to tackle difficult resource management issues.

He stated that the goal for this meeting was to create viable alternatives for reserve designs.

**Report from Public Outreach Committee on the Public Forum held October 12<sup>th</sup> in Goleta**

Craig Fusaro began by stating his goal for the meeting was to avoid the standard "talking head" type forum. At the forum he introduced the MRWG process, briefly described the information maps and charts on the walls, and provided the public with opportunity to comment. He noticed a strong showing from the "left, right, and middle" perspectives. Audience participants shared information on a variety of values of the resources, from fishing to biodiversity.

Several issues were raised at the forum. Sean will have a detailed summary soon. There were approximately 70 – 100 comments received. Please refer to the public forum overview hand out.

Patty Wolf thanked Craig for moderating and the MRWG members for being active participants. She felt the public meeting was time well spent and many important issues were aired. She believes the attitude of the general public has changed since the first forum of "why are we here." to one of "where are we going." She saw the MRWG thinking and acting as a cohesive group, even though individual members represented their own interests. A consensus attitude and process was evident. As the MRWG moves to putting lines on the map it is important to remain a cohesive community group.

Sean Hastings distributed a two-page review of the public forum and the categories of the comments and questions raised. He pointed out as an observer at the forum that the MRWG consistently showed a voice of unity, even when displaying their personal views. One issue that needs to be addressed is in the title of the fishermen created "exclusion zone"— this caused confusion among many participants who mistook the title to mean proposed no-take, or fishing exclusion zones, not zones where fishermen don't want

Marine Reserves Working Group  
Draft Meeting Summary  
Wednesday, October 18, 2000

reserves.

Tom Raftican also recognized Craig Fusaro's forum management leadership and noted that Neil Guglielmo described the MRWG process very well, which set the tone for the meeting. He felt most participants left very satisfied.

Bob Fletcher has talked with people after the meeting where he got a feeling that many wanted to discuss the lines on the maps. Given the size of the crowd, however, that would have been difficult during the forum. Though we do have lines, Bob felt that another forum to discuss reserve areas is essential.

Craig Fusaro agrees that we need to have another public forum. Also need to discuss how to have 300 people leave a meeting feeling they have had a real chance for input.

Greg Helms felt challenged in representing a whole group of people with varied interests; he felt protective of his constituency and wondered how to not dilute the views of a smaller voice in a meeting dominated by one group. His tally of comments showed 20 pro reserve, 12 anti reserve, and 12 other issues. He also noted the problem with the term "exclusion zone" and suggested the title be changed, perhaps to "important fishing zone."

Steve Roberson was worried before the forum began that it would fall apart, but was impressed with the end result. He also thanked Neil for setting a good example of how the process is supposed to work.

Neil Guglielmo also felt the number of people present was overwhelming. He noticed people from different backgrounds were communicating with one another. He suggested reducing the number of fishermen at the forum by asking fishing representatives to attend; this would allow various groups to be evenly represented. Neil suggested specific questions could be choreographed to direct audience input toward the maps and reserves and to keep the dialogue more focussed than it has been in the last two forums. He noted total cooperation is not there yet due to the fear of the unknown in the fishing community.

Chris Miller noticed that people wanted to know more about the implementation issues rather than if reserves are necessary. He felt having the environmental and fishing communities rub shoulders was good. He feels the Science Panel recommendation creates winners and losers, and that the final recommendation should not have winners

and losers; he is seeking a win/win scenario. Chris pointed out that conservation based fishermen are an important part of the community. Also, there were a lot of unanswered questions at the forum that need to be addressed.

Alicia Stratton asked if having the MRWG host the forum (as opposed to the agencies) worked and how was the forum advertised?

Sean Hastings noted that the MRWG run forum appeared to have worked well. Regarding advertising of the forum, the Sanctuary had paid ads in all of the local newsprint, as well as requested notice in the newspapers calendar announcements. A media advisory was sent to the Sanctuary's 100+ media contacts, and notice was posted on the Sanctuary's various email lists. Surprisingly, no reporters attended the forum. A student group from the Brooks Institute was there to make a documentary; the film should be available to the MRWG.

Alicia Stratton was concerned that Ventura was not represented at the forum

Tom Raftican replied that Ventura sport boat owners were present. Part of the problem in getting people to the forum was the lack of time to prepare and advertise the event.

Patty Wolf reminded the group that the last minute planning was due to the uncertainty of where the MRWG would be at the end of the previous meeting. However, we do need more lead time for future forums.

Craig Fusaro suggested hosting another forum, and advertising with radio announcements and other media. He also added that there is a need to find a structure for hosting and facilitating future public forums.

Mike Eng finished the discussion with a caveat that the group would come back to this topic at the end of the day to decide when the next public meeting should be scheduled. He suggested tasking the MRWG's public outreach subcommittee to begin planning the next forum.

Patty Wolf asked why the last reference regarding percentages was removed from the list in the Science Panel handout at the forum?

Satie Airame replied that the referenced paper was not accepted for publication due to a

lack of supporting evidence, so it was not included in the literature review.

**Summary of Constituent Outreach and Feedback:** John Jostes asked each member to describe their latest outreach efforts and any feed back from constituent.

Marla Daily received a letter from the Nature Conservancy who owns 76% of Santa Cruz Island. They support closures, but requested that both Prisoner's Harbor and Christie Beach remain open for their traditional uses.

Alicia Stratton said that Surfrider Foundation interests include both protection and access, that public meetings are important, and that the S. side of Santa Cruz should remain open. A common misunderstanding is that reserves mean no access, which needs to be corrected.

Neil Guglielmo had a meeting with 25 fishermen and Representative Allan Lowenthal of San Pedro, CA. Several issues and concerns were raised, including:

- What is the possibility of compensation for lost income?
- More economic impact data of options is needed;
- 30-50% is too large and we should consider limited take reserves as opposed to no take areas;
- If more shoreline is needed, reserves could go out to a specific depth;
- There has been a rush on entering the squid fishery and much of it occurs in the Channel Islands;
- They don't want more boats in a smaller area;
- A payback for permits might eliminate some fishermen;
- The fishing community wants insurance that more reserves won't come later;
- There is support for phasing in reserves over time.

Marla Daily asked Neil if the squid fleet used Santa Barbara Island?

Neil – Yes they do.

Craig Fusaro said he was trying to balance the variety of public at large views, and that it is important to maintain a science based process and consider user group interests. The goal being to maximize benefits and minimizes pain.

Marine Reserves Working Group

Draft Meeting Summary

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

Greg Helms noted that he is getting direction from regional and national offices as well as local constituents that the MRWG decision needs to be science based and incorporate a long-term vision for protection. The original reserve maps lack coverage on each island. He noted that the environmental community is concerned about what to do to make sure the local fishing community comes out of this process standing on their feet. There may be a willingness to discuss issues of compensation and implementation. There is also growing interest from elected officials in this process.

Mike Eng asked Greg if conservation groups would be against monetarily supporting compensation. Greg stated that traditionally they would, but in this case they might consider it if it would facilitate a positive change.

Bob Fletcher met with local charter boat operators from San Pedro to Santa Barbara to discuss loss of fishing grounds, rockfish closures, the marine reserves process and the upcoming Fish and Game Commission meeting. There is fear of these multiple process and some lingering anger over the original reserve closure proposal. Other issues raised included the proposed four-month rockfish closures in southern CA, and possible new quotas on nearshore fish. Recreational anglers are now looking at what pieces of territory they need, and what they can give up. Santa Barbara Island, Anacapa, and SE Santa Cruz Island (SCI) can't be given up. Gull Island to Forneys could be included in a reserve, however, nothing east of Laguna Point on the south side of SCI. The original 20% closure proposal doesn't look so bad now. They would like to stretch out implementation and phase in reserves. There was a good showing of San Pedro fishermen at the public forum.

Alicia Stratton asked if both Bob and Neil could make maps of the areas that fishermen want to keep out of reserves.

Bob Fletcher stated that a lot of San Pedro people left the public meeting unhappy because there was little discussion about the maps.

Sean Hastings said that the Sanctuary has received hundreds of public comments, submitted via email, public comment forms, letters and postcards, from around the country; approx. 500 to date, mostly emails. The majority of comments support biodiversity. A couple of letters from local dive boats and filmmakers note the potential for economic benefits from reserves. The Channel Islands Yacht Club sent a letter in support of reserves too. A handful of letters in opposition to reserves has been received,

Marine Reserves Working Group

Draft Meeting Summary

Wednesday, October 18, 2000

mainly from recreational interests, there is also concern over economic impacts of reserves.

Patty Wolf noted that DFG staff needed to review the mapping options and provide commentary. She is looking at goals and objectives, particularly resource issues such as birds, abalone and rockfish recovery. Gull Island appears to be an important area for abalone recovery. The windward sides of Santa Barbara and Anacapa Islands are important for reserve consideration. She sees a need to look at how reserves integrate with other resource management issues, as well as look for common areas of reserve interest. Patty noted that the PFMC meets Oct. 31 with their marine reserve committee, and the Fish and Game Commission on Oct. 19 & 20 in San Diego, where she will provide and update on the MRWG process; Sean will attend the San Diego meeting too.

Bob Fletcher questioned if abalone should be an issue, as it is already protected?

Patty responded that abalone should be considered. The consideration of the effects of fishing on the abalone's habitat, prey and predators are important to consider in the recovery of abalone.

Sean Hastings added that Sanctuary staff has been refining options. They are also consulting NOAA enforcement staff. He attended the latest Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) meeting, and brought to the attention of the PFMC the MRWG Process and progress. Sean has been communicating with PFMC staff on their Ad-hoc Marine Reserve Committee process and the MRWG process.

Tom Raftican has been doing radio and TV spots and meeting with local fishing clubs. Feedback is one of resignation to reserves and fishery problems, and wondering if reserves will address these problems. Some of the reserve successes elsewhere have helped address recreational fishermen concerns. Tom pointed out that recreational fishing investment in management (i.e. license fees) will be lost because fishing areas may be closed. He stated that the loss in fishing areas must be balanced by benefits. Important areas to leave out of reserves include Prisoner's and Chinese Harbors, SCI. The concept of allowing some activities in buffer zones, catch and release is well received by his constituents; recreational fishermen are interested in quality fishing, not always quantity of fishing.

Gary Davis stated that he has a very narrow constituency, the Dept. of Interior. The

Departments of Commerce and Interior are compiling a national inventory of marine protected areas. This inventory will likely be used for a “gap analyses”. The Park’s obligation is to protect and preserve, which includes sustaining fishing and biodiversity for future generations. The Science Panel’s advice was received favorably by the Park, and is compatible with the Park mission. He had Park rangers, biologists, and other staff develop options, and common areas were found. Practical issues, such as enforcement were also brought up. They tried to ensure that Park waters were adequately represented, boundaries of reserves ran in cardinal directions, major anchorage’s were avoided, enough shoreline was protected, as well as species concerns addressed, i.e. marine mammal and seabirds.

Chris Miller has been talking to people on the docks, as well as leaders of fishing groups (SUHAC, SB Commercial Fishermen, local harbormaster, PCFFA, Lobster Trappers Association, etc). The “rank and file” fishermen are in shock over the Science Panel recommendation. He has uncovered an old petition, with over 800 signatures, seeking to uphold the current fisheries management framework; the petition was given to the local harbormaster. Fishermen continually bring-up reserve implementation issues to his attention (i.e. enforcement). Nearshore rockfishermen are very concerned. He has also ground truthed Milton Love’s rockfish reserve recommendation with fishermen. Chris asked the following questions: What does the Science Panel recommendation mean for the process? How are the MRWG and Science Panel assimilating existing management, i.e. brood stock refugia, in this process? If we make CINMS a discreet management unit how will it offset other closures, i.e. seasonal rockfish closures? How does the Georges Bank reserve example apply to the Channel Islands region and reserve process? How do we incorporate fishermen’s local ecological knowledge into the process? What is the relationship of this process to the Marine Life Management Act? There should be a focus on rockfish issues and Milton Love’s input and veteran fishermen and then ground truth areas with oral history. He wants to follow Florida’s Tortuga model with the fishermen developing their own maps. He also wants to present to the MRWG a MPA template as an option.

Chris announced that a Pacific Coast Port and Harbor meeting would take place on November 17, 2000 in Monterey, CA. The local harbormasters intend on discussing socio-economic concerns with Dan Basta, Acting Sanctuary Chief.

Locky Brown stated that the diverse diving community, both consumptive and non-consumptive divers, are engaged. He sent out a “design your own reserve” map, thanks



to the Center Marine Conservation for providing the map; a Bakersfield dive club has returned a map.

Craig Fusaro suggested sending the “design your own reserve map” out to everyone.

Mark Helvey had spoken to NMFS enforcement staff as well as staff at the Southwest Fisheries Science Center (Science Center). Enforcement prefers fewer and smaller areas, which are not necessarily mutually exclusive. They do not support a reserve at Santa Barbara Island (SBI) because it is too far offshore to adequately enforce. An inshore reserve (within 3 miles) around SBI might be okay. The enforcement group did not like the idea of halos and buffer areas. Cowcod and Bocaccio rebuilding areas are important. The Science Center staff wanted options to be evaluated and validated, adding that the biogeographic provinces are not as important as fished and nonfished and windward and leeward areas.

Dale Glantz checked with kelp harvesters and received both positive and negative feedback. They were pretty excited and support the reserve mapping concepts with a little tinkering. No single option will put them out of business. The bad news is that the initial habitat review shows that not enough kelp is in the reserve options and increasing area could be detrimental to his industry. The 30 – 50% closure recommendations are a concern because the Science Panel did not consider existing management.

Steve Roberson’s constituents would like to see more shoreline. He also talked to Milton Love to learn about important rockfish habitat.

Mike McGinnes said that electronic mail is an effective tool for his outreach efforts. He has received a contract from UC Press to write a book on the bioregion. He has sent information and a working policy brief on this process both state and nation-wide. There has been general support for a systems approach to resource management. He wants to insure that marine mammals, birds and fish are all considered in reserve siting. Two of his articles will be appearing soon in the journals Ecological Law Quarterly and Conservation Law Quarterly.

## **Morning Break**

**Ecological Analysis of Marine Reserve Options:** Satie Airame clarified some points of the Science Panel Recommendation.

There is a lot of theoretical information in the reserve literature.

There are positive short-term empirical results in the literature beyond the Georges Bank example. For instance, the Kennedy Center Space Merritt Island Wildlife Reserve has shown an increase in the export of fish larvae. The reserve has demonstrated biodiversity, biomass, and individual sizes have all increased. World sport fishing records have been caught near the reserve too

.

As to the question: does 30 – 50 % protect biodiversity? she replied yes and no. Thirty percent set aside will probably protect 70 – 80% of species about which we know something. However, it would take a 70% reserve to protect all species. A 50% closure would protect about 85% of species.

Greg Helms asked about the effectiveness of reserves as size increases.

Satie responded that there is a point of diminishing returns, probably after a 70% set-aside, where you would see an increase in population size.

Bob Fletcher stated that shallow species occur in deeper water too, and the proposed Fish and Game Commission deep-water closures will protect some of these species; even though it is not set up to do so.

Satie Airame clarified that the Science Panel did not consider areas outside of the CINMS boundary, because the MRWG is only considering areas within CINMS.

Chris Miller asked if the Science Panel used an estimate of extinction risk for specific species in the modeling?

Satie replied yes, the modeling in the recommendation used these estimates; there were several other estimates that went into the modeling as well. She said the Science Panel recommends at least one reserve in each biogeographic zone (cold, warm and transition), with three large reserves being preferable than many small ones. However, increasing the number of reserves would protect species and habitat from a catastrophe occurring in any one reserve as well as provide a comparative system for study. Dividing the areas too much leads to difficult enforcement. So the Science Panel recommends 3 to 6 reserves within CINMS. The Science Panel also looked only at NO TAKE reserves, if some are

limited take they would have to be added in addition to the recommended no-take set aside. Also, an ecosystem approach considers all species in the natural system, not just commercially or recreationally valued species.

Chris Miller asked if the three biogeographic zones were based on only 8 years of temperature data?

Satie responded that temperature data were from the last 5 to 8 years, biological data were from the last 20 to 25 years. She also said the biogeographic zonation is not an absolute distinction.

She noted that if you overlay the reserve map concepts to date, there is common ground among 3 to 9 options. One caveat she made was that one of the MRWG breakout groups only produced one map, so their views have less strength than others do in the summed analyses.

Craig Fusaro asked what some of the habitat criteria mean. Satie responded that submerged rocky habitat refer to unique rocky features. She added that errors in the analysis tables are possible. Also, in the analyses of any option with buffer zones these zones had to be considered NO TAKE, therefore the percentage of coverage in options C1A and C2 are overestimated.

Satie noted the following generalities:

- 1) Rocky intertidal was under represented in all options
- 2) Kelp forest was underrepresented in the Californian Province
- 3) Surf grass was underrepresented in the Transition and Californian Provinces.

Greg Helms asked why rocky intertidal is so important and underrepresented. Satie replied it is very diverse habitat, species rich and close to shore. It should be represented in a reserve scenario.

Mike Eng asked if Satie could explain why a very low percentage of eelgrass representation is considered enough. Satie said that a small representation of a small total area in this rare habitat is acceptable. Highly productive areas are not weighted more heavily.

Chris Miller asked if the relative proportions of each habitat were shown somewhere. Satie responded that the information is available in the tables she provided.

Mike Eng asked if the Science Panel was ready to look at a weighted recommendation. Satie said that as long as the recommendation comes with some explanation of why it was made, the Science Panel could review it.

Bruce Steele asked Satie to clarify what she meant when she said that in every reserve case study, where enforcement wasn't a problem, something happened. Satie reiterated that in all of the reserve examples there has shown an increase sizes, abundance, biomass, etc. unless they were unenforced, too small, or in an unsuitable habitat.

Bruce Steele reminded Satie that the Science Panel was ignoring the fact that sea otters will effect macro invertebrates in a reserve and there won't be more or bigger individuals.

Satie responded that sea otters traditionally occurred here, and ecological impacts have happened in their absence. Fisheries have developed, exploiting the species that proliferated in the absence of otter predation. The return of otters would definitely affect current macro invertebrate levels, and may cause them to decline, not to biological extinction levels, but perhaps to commercially unviable levels.

Chris Miller said that one goal is to look at larval export, this should be related to the weighting of habitats. Can the scientists give us a categorization of areas good for export?

Satie informed the group that within a biodiversity model habitats are weighted equally, however the scientists can consider other MRWG goals.

Craig Fusaro emphasized that the Science Panel has given its best advice, and it is the MRWG's job to take in to account other criteria. Gary Davis emphasized this point as well.

Chris Miller reminded the panel that this is an experiment, and must deal with the progress of using marine reserves. He said that larval export is critical.

Craig Fusaro recounted that the Science Panel said that science does not exist to say where sources are, that we have to use local knowledge and best judgement and attempt

to find sources of larval export.

Steve Roberson asked if the agencies would move otters out of San Miguel?

The otter issue is being addressed by the US Fish and Wildlife, removal of otters from the established otter management zone is under their purview and is being considered.

Satie Airame said that in order to satisfy criteria for replication, you must have more than one area in each region.

Greg Helms spent some time with the maps. He reminded the group not to drop to the lowest common denominator and only choose areas of agreement. He thought MRWG might take the best map as a starting point, i.e. B3.

Mike Eng noted that the largest area covered is not necessarily the best option, and reminded the group to look at the summed maps and information.

John Jostes rhetorically asked how we move forward to 3 proposals to send to the Science and Socioeconomic panels? He and Mike Eng devised the following process:

The group should look for common areas, and take the ground rules in to account to craft the best options. Five sub-groups of common interest will each weigh what we have now. He asked the groups to go with their basic interests, then make a proposal that will engender agreement. He reminded the MRWG not to commit to one view. The group was asked to work through lunch and afterward, then to reconvene with 5 proposals, and winnow them down to the three best to move forward. Three coordinators would then be appointed to get feedback and adjust the three proposals accordingly in sub committees. At the end of the day he suggested the group would talk about how the map will fit into the final recommendation.

## **LUNCH**

**Refinement of Options into Alternative Recommendations:** Five groups met to prepare options, each group tried to take everyone's positions into consideration, without compromising a good option.

Group A: Patty W., Mark H., Sean H., Gary D.

Group B: Greg H., Steve R., Alicia S., Mike M.

Group C: Neil G., Chris M., Dale G.

Group D: Bob F., Tom R., Locky B.

Group E: Craig Fusaro, Deborah McArdle

**Presentation of Draft Recommendation Framework:** John Jostes distributed a draft outline of a final recommendation proposal. He stated that it was the initial framework of a single text to bring the final recommendation forward. The framework included the following parts: Signature Page, Background, Ground Rules, Mission Statement, Problem Statement, Fears and Concerns, Goals and Objectives, “the map”, Recommendations (purpose, and implementation), Other Recommendations, Appendices (incl. Definitions), Participants – please refer to Working Draft handout.

Mike Eng emphasized that concerns can be added and it is a work in progress.

Craig Fusaro asked if the MRWG could mix and match objectives. Mike Eng replied that at this point it is better to add new ideas, not change old ones.

Bruce Steele interjected that he wanted to make it known that he was very displeased with the fact that the sport and commercial interest groups were split in the mapping exercise.

Mike Eng responded that this is an iterative process and we are making progress.

**Continuation of Alternatives Development:** Each of the five groups presented its option, using the decision support tool. Mike Eng asked the group to pick three reserve options.

Bob Fletcher responded that they should not choose three of the five.

Chris Miller said the MRWG needed input on socioeconomic data. He asked how these options are meeting the goals and objectives and stated that the MRWG must finalize the goals and objectives before moving on.

Mark Helvey stated that positives and negatives needed to be seen with goals and objectives in hand.

Steve Roberson saw no problem with getting input from the Science Panel.

Chris Miller reiterated that the MRWG couldn't decide what the three best options are without more interaction.

Bob Fletcher said the MRWG needs advice from the Science Panel, not give them the reigns to decide for the MRWG. He stated that now we are asking them to gauge it on their target, not the MRWG's target. Personally, he would weigh much more heavily on socioeconomics. He said that the 5,600 mile Cowcod closure outside this area must be considered.

Mike Eng and John Jostes reminded the MRWG that they provide the reserve options and the Socioeconomic and Science Panels provide an expert review.

Steve Roberson suggested that a one-month review, then with the common areas, begin work on compromising.

Alicia Stratton agreed that the group needed more time to talk.

Mike Eng asked if the group could pick three and incorporate the others?

Tom Raftican said that the group needed a clear idea of where it is going and therefore needs to clarify the socioeconomic goals. He stated that afterwards the group could start with common areas.

Bob Fletcher expressed his dislike with the 30 – 50% recommendation. He said the group needed to know the percent of good habitat.

Mike McGinnes stated that it is time to start thinking about how to deal with unfavorable information and that if the group didn't learn from the expert advice, the process was doomed.

Satie Airame asked what the MRWG wanted from the Science Panel this month.

Greg Helms wanted a quick jpeg of the five options.

Ben Waltenberger said he would make bigger plots, so detailed lines can be drawn.

Chris Miller felt the Science Panel didn't understand the MRWG's intent and that the group needed to work more on these issues before passing anything else along. He wanted to balance the goals.

Greg Helms believed the Science Panel would give valuable input. He stated the group had to look at our proposals and decide what to do with the reality of the issues.

John Jostes confirmed that the group did not seem to want to pass these maps to the Science Panel right now. He stated that the facilitators would send out forms for the members to list in priority what their main concerns are for each map. He said that those concerns would be incorporated into a summary and brought to the next meeting.

Deborah McArdle rhetorically asked how would the group analyze these five options and stated that they needed some more information on them.

Tom Raftican said the group must finalize the goals and objectives.

Sean Hastings said the Socioeconomic Panel could provide factual information on impacts.

Bruce Steele pointed out some similarities/overlap in the five options. He stated that three maps were modified versions of option 1A. He reminded the group that things are moving forward. In appreciation of his efforts Satie gave Bruce a stuffed sea otter.

Steve Roberson said that the group needed to take common areas at the start of the next meeting and then add what is necessary.

Chris Miller reminded the MRWG that reserves are a precautionary measure and they should not put any single fishery "on the rocks".

In summary, Mike Eng asked all MRWG members to evaluate each of the five options. He stated that the group would start with the maps at the beginning of the next meeting. He also reminded the MRWG that it needed to finalize the socioeconomic goal and objectives, members should be sure to send comments in between meetings.

**ADJOURN**